1 2	BEFURE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	In the Matter of MUR 6260 ANDREW "ROCKY" RADZKOWSKI ROCKY FOR CONGRESS AND SCOTT B. MACKENZIE, AS TREASURER CASE CLOSURE UNDER THE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY SYSTEM OF THE STREASURE SYSTEM OF TH
1	GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT
12	Under the Enforcement Priority System, matters that are low-rated
13	
14	are forwarded to the Commission with a recommendation for dismissal. The
15	Commission has determined that pursuing low-rated matters, compared to other higher rated
16	matters on the Enforcement docket, warrants the exercise of its prosecutorial discretion to
17	dismiss these cases. The Office of General Counsel scored MUR 6260 as a low-rated matter.
18	In this matter, the complainant, Brian D. Pierce, asserts that Andrew "Rocky"
19	Raczkowski, a candidate for Congress in Michigan's Ninth Congressional District, and his
20	campaign committee, Rocky for Congress and Scott B. Mackenzie, in his official capacity as
21	treasurer ("the Committee"), violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as
22	amended ("the Act"), and its underlying regulations, by including defective disclaimers in two
23	campaign communications. First, the complainant states that, during February 2010, the
24	Committee began running a radio advertisement promoting Mr. Raczkowski's candidacy for
25	Congress. According to the complainant, although "the beginning of the ad" was "in
26	compliance by disclaiming that the ad is paid for by 'Rocky for Congress,'" Mr. Raczko
27	allegedly failed to state "My name is Rocky Raczkowski and I approve this message."
28	pursuant to 2 U.S.C. § 441d(d)(1)(A) and 11 C.F.R. § 110.11(c)(3). Attached to t

Case Closure under EPS -- MUR 6260 Page 2 of 4

- 1 complaint is what purports to be a transcript of the advertisement, which includes the
- 2 statements "This ad has been paid for by Rocky for Congress," and "I'm Rocky Raczkowski,"
- 3 but lacks "stand by your ad" language by the candidate.
- 4 Second, the complainant maintains that "a recent direct mail fundraising letter"
- 5 disseminated by the Committee fails to enclose the disclaimer "Paid for by Rocky for
- 6 Congress" within a printed box, as required by 2 U.S.C. § 441d(c)(2) and 11 C.F.R.
- 7 § 110.11(c)(2)(ii). A photocopy of what appears to be the letter, which is dated January 28,
- 8 2010, and solicits contributions and other forms of assistance, includes the disclaimer "This
- 9 Letter has been paid for by Rocky for Congress," on the bottom left-hand side, which is
- marked with an asterisks but is not contained within a printed box.
- In its response, the Committee, which apparently replied on behalf of
- 12 Mr. Raczkowski as well, stated that it would obtain a "complete recording" of the radio
- 13 advertisement in question and a copy of the mailing, and would forward them to this Office.
- 14 Subsequently, the Committee provided us with an MP3 file of the radio advertisement, the
- 15 contents of which are consistent with the text provided by the complainant. In addition, the
- 16 Committee provided an electronic version of the fundraising letter which, like the
- 17 complainant's version, is dated January 28, 2010. Although the Committee's fundraising
- 18 letter appears to be virtually identical to the photocopy supplied by the complainant, it
- 19 includes a slightly different disclaimer—"Paid for by: Rocky for Congress"—which is
- 20 marked with an asteriaks and is also printed in darker type than the surrounding text. The
- 21 disclaimer is not contained in a printed box. Aside from providing the audio file and the
- 22 fundraising letter, the Committee does not address the complainant's allegations.

Case Closure under EPS – MUR 6260 Page 3 of 4

1 In listening to the campaign radio advertisement, it suggests that appropriate disclaimers 2 may have been required, including a statement made by the candidate approving the message, as 3 set forth in 2 U.S.C. § 441d(d)(1)(A) and 11 C.F.R. § 110.11(c)(3). In addition, if the fundraising letters constituted part of a "mass mailing." defined as a mailing of over 500 pieces 4 5 of identical or substantially similar mail matter within a 30-day period, see 11 C.F.R. § 100.27. 6 they would likely have constituted "public communications," as set forth in 11 C.F.R. § 100.26. 7 which would have made them subject to the FEC's disclaimer requirements at 2 U.S.C. § 441d. 8 and 11 C.F.R. \$ 110.11. 9 It appears that the communications contained sufficient identifying information to prevent the public from being misled as to who paid for them. Additionally, the violations of 10 11 2 U.S.C. § 441d and 11 C.F.R. § 110.11, in this particular case, appear to be technical in nature. 12 Thus, in furtherance of the Commission's priorities and resources, relative to other matters pending on the Enforcement docket, the Office of General Counsel believes that the Commission 13 14 should exercise its prosecutorial discretion and diamiss this matter. See Heckler v. Chanev. 15 470 U.S. 821 (1985). Additionally, this Office intends on reminding Andrew "Rocky" 16 Raczkowaki, and Rocky for Congress and Scott B. Mackenzie, in his official capacity as 17 treasurer, of the requirements under 2 U.S.C. § 441d and 11 C.F.R. § 110.11 concerning the use 18 of appropriate disclaimers on campaign radio advertisements and mailings. 19 RECOMMENDATIONS 20 The Office of General Counsel recommends that the Commission dismiss MUR 6260, 21 close the file, and approve the appropriate letters. In addition, this Office recommends 22 reminding Andrew "Rocky" Raczkowski, and Rocky for Congress and Scott B. Mackenzie, in 23 his official capacity as treasurer, of the requirements under 2 U.S.C. § 441d and 11 C.F.R.

١

§ 110.11 concerning the use of appropriate disclaimers on campaign radio advertisements and mailings. Thomasenia P. Duncan **General Counsel** 6 7 8 BY: Gregoly R. Ba Special Counsel **Complaints Examination** & Legal Administration Supervisory Agorney **Complaints Examination** & Legal Administration

Attorney

Complaints Examination

& Legal Administration